

fact, it refers to the fundamental purpose of the motion. The fundamental purpose of this motion does relate to H.R. 2857, as required by sections 935 and 936 of the House manual.

The report on H.R. 2857 from the gentleman's committee states clearly in its statement of purpose of the bill found on page 57 of that report that the legislation seeks to emphasize, and I quote, "the critical role of service in meeting the national priorities of emergency and disaster preparedness; and improves program integrity." That is from the report on the bill from the gentleman's committee.

In other words, the critical issue of homeland security provides the required nexus between the subject matters of H.R. 2857 and the motions as required under sections 935 and 936 of the House manual.

Further, I would argue, it is clear that the subject matter requirements of section 935 and 936 of the House manual are satisfied. A specific section of the legislation brought to the floor by the gentleman's committee relating to "Emergency and Disaster Preparedness" provides on page 71 of the gentleman's committee report that "H.R. 2857 supports the role of service in addressing emergency and disaster preparedness." These are the words from the gentleman's committee's report. "In addition, this program may engage Federal, State, and local stakeholders to collaborate to achieve a more effective response to issue public safety, public health, emergencies and disasters."

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I insist upon my point of order. The gentleman again is speaking to the scheduling of the floor of the House. The bill, in its entirety, speaks to national voluntary service. The gentleman, I guess, is talking about the intelligence service. And the fact of the matter is, under the point of order there is nothing in this legislation within the jurisdiction of the committees, for the motion to recommit, of the Intelligence Committee or the Judiciary Committee, and I insist upon my point of order.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. May I continue my response?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will continue to hear the gentleman from California as long as he confines his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I was attempting to specify the germaneness, quoting specifically from the language of the committee report justifying support for this bill. I did not bring up public safety, public health, emergencies and disasters and effective response thereto. That is the premise contained in the bill and the committee report.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, if we are to be able to respond to public safety, emergencies, and disasters, it does not limit it in the

language of the gentleman's committee report to natural disasters. It therefore includes man-made disasters, of which we are very, very cognizant. And 9/11 is perhaps the greatest example. So the bill itself justifies its existence in that the individuals, under the ambit of the bill, to support responses for public safety, public health, emergencies, and disasters are affected in very specific ways by our capacity, our capacity, to determine beforehand what the nature of the disasters and emergencies would be and therefore allow us to array our individuals under this bill in concert, as is stated by the gentleman's report, to collaborate with Federal, State, and local stakeholders. In that way my amendment is very much germane to the main purpose of the bill and the specifics of the bill.

Finally, the language of H.R. 2857 emphasizes the ability to deploy the National Civilian Community Corps to emergencies and disasters. It does not limit it to natural emergencies or disasters, therefore including terrorist attacks.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order. Again, had we been involved with the committees of jurisdiction that the gentleman is referring to, the bill would have been referred by the Parliamentarian to those committees, and it was not. And let me just inform the gentleman. I know he's been out for a couple of days and he comes back with great vigor, and I admire his arguments. But there is nothing within the programs of Teach for America or the Boys and Girls Club of America or the Big Brothers Big Sisters program or the YouthBuild or the National Council on Aging or the Senior Citizen Nutrition Program or the American Red Cross, there is nothing in those programs that require that they eavesdrop or wiretap anybody's phones before they can deliver their services. And there is nothing within the jurisdiction of this legislation or of this committee that deals with those matters, and there is nothing in this bill that deals with the matters within the jurisdiction of those committees. And I insist upon my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will allow the gentleman from California 2 minutes to close his argument.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says, with some humor in his voice, that we ought not to be considering the question of wiretapping. That is not the question we bring before us today. The question we bring before of us today and why this is germane is whether or not we have the ability to listen in on those who would kill us and therefore prepare for these disasters before they occur and, more than that, prevent them.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California is required to speak to the point of order.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I am speaking to the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair has estimated that the gentleman would need 2 minutes to conclude his argument, and 1 minute remains.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman must speak to the point of order which has been made with respect to the fact that there is nothing in this committee speaking to those jurisdictions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is willing to hear the gentleman from California for another minute to conclude his argument on the point of order.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, to suggest that intelligence gathered to prevent disaster has nothing to do with the ability of those we are asking under this bill to respond to disaster reminds one of the comment in literature years ago when one was confronted with the incongruity of the law and that person responded by saying: The law, sir, is an ass.

I would not suggest we are at that point here, but I would suggest this: for anyone to say that, to blind ourselves to the information that would allow us to prevent disasters and prepare for the disasters, to say that that is irrelevant to the debate today shows how irrelevant the debate today is to the needs of the people of the State of California, the Nation, and, frankly, our allies. It is germane, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair has heard the gentlemen's argument.

The Chair will hear individual Members in turn. They may not yield to one another. They may not interrupt one another except by proper objection concerning relevance.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I insist upon my point of order.

And I appreciate that perhaps there's some confusion on the other side of the aisle between the Big Brothers of this program and Big Brother that you're thinking about.

I insist upon my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

As the Chair most recently ruled on March 5, 2008, the instructions in the motion to recommit address a matter unrelated to the issues addressed in the underlying bill, and within the jurisdiction of committees not represented in the underlying bill. The instructions are therefore not germane, and the point of order is sustained. The motion is not in order.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to appeal the Speaker's ruling, with all due respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is: Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?